From: al.scott@us.army.mil@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/27/02 9:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I have read the

proposed settlement. It thoroughly addresses oversight of prohibited behavior on the part of Microsoft. I feel it is a step in the right direction but it is short sighted as it really does not say ?What you did was wrong, now pay a price for having done so.?

Nothing

addresses any penalties for having operated as a monopoly. This to me ignores the harm done to the industry and customers to date. I also feel there is a serious dilemma in setting any penalties.

One side me says ?this nation enjoys a leading role in global information technology, we should not hurt our overall standing?; the other side says ?a crime should never pay, there must be an appropriate punishment?. The settlement as proposed never even entertains an aspect of just punishment.

## Microsoft is a

monopoly and enjoys the leverage of being the desktop operating system publisher for the world. It can spread into almost any other market segment if only by virtue of having enough money to buy into one. Their dominance today is built on their past containment, absorption, and removal of other competing companies and technologies. A lot of inspired innovation died along the way to getting to the current market state. There is

no commercially viable x86 operating system in existence. Just weeks ago another company Be OS failed. There is almost no way to make a business of a selling a new operating system without selling it with a non-Intel based computer system. Microsoft has a commanding lead and has locked out competition for the desktop OS market, for both consumer and business users.

The wealth of this corporation limits any meaningful financial penalty. Monetarily, I do not feel a dollar figure can be set that would really impact them because the cost would only be passed on to the customers. In effect, we as its customers, would be billing ourselves.

Here are three

possible penalties:

1. Prohibit

Microsoft and its major affiliates from merging or spreading into any other diversifying business ventures for the next three to five years. In effect freeze Microsoft?s current expansion for a fixed period of time giving competitors some opportunity to survive and

grow.

2. Set up a venture capital startup fund using \$1 billion paid by Microsoft to support new alternative (competing) U.S. based operating system and software developers. **Prohibit** Microsoft from ever acquiring or partnering with these companies.

3. Encourage sectors of the

U.S. government to procure fewer Microsoft products by offering budgetary inducements through GSA for using alternative sourced products for a period of three to five years. This opportunity would encourage developers to bring new products to market possibly spurring competition and better pricing. Consumers would benefit in having more choices.

Sincerely, Alvin Scott